

Dwayne Tolliver 20070072569

MHN

P.O. Box 089002

FILED

6796

Div. 936

7-24-2008

Case No 07C6769

JUL 24 2008

mb

Chicago, Ill. 60608

MICHAEL W. DOBBINS
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Judge William J. Hibbler

Dwayne Tolliver Vs. City of Chicago, et al

To Recondersated this document

I have only come up with the Mayor of City of Chicago, Mayor Richard Daley states he will not turn these Chicago Police Officer names from 3340 W. Fillmore his Special Force that when to Police Misconduct against me and other Citizens of Chicago. The Mayor Daley stated that on TiV, sometime ago.

The Officer from Grand & Central was one Detective Spandon something like that I can't spell his name 7703 Shift and the City of Chicago haven't provide me with any assistance of names of Chicago Police Officers

Dwayne Tolliver

Order Form (01/2005)



United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---------------|
| Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge | William J. Hibbler | Sitting Judge If Other than Assigned Judge | |
| CASE NUMBER | 07 C 6796 | DATE | July 14, 2008 |
| CASE TITLE | Dawayne Tolliver (#2007-0072569) v. City of Chicago | | |

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT:

Plaintiff's amended complaint [10] is stricken. Plaintiff is directed to comply with the Court's order of April 30, 2008. Failure to comply with the April 30, 2008 order will result in dismissal of this case. The clerk shall forward a copy of the April 30, 2008 order, along with a copy of this order, to plaintiff.

☐ [For further details see text below.]

Wm. J. Hibbler

Docketing to mail notices.

STATEMENT

On April 30, 2008, the Court granted plaintiff Dawayne Tolliver's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and allowed his complaint to proceed against the City of Chicago. The Court explained that plaintiff may have stated valid claims that he was harassed and falsely arrested by Chicago police officers on two separate occasions on August 21, 2007 and September 23, 2007. Because plaintiff did not know the names of the officers involved, the Court allowed the case to proceed against the City of Chicago, in its supervisory role, to allow plaintiff to conduct discovery to learn the identities of the unknown officers. Plaintiff was given 60 days from the date of an attorney's appearance for the City of Chicago to learn the unknown officers' names and the Court warned that plaintiff's failure to attempt to learn their identities will result in dismissal. An attorney for the City of Chicago has entered an appearance on June 19, 2008. The warning in the April 30, 2008 order still stands.

Plaintiff has submitted an amended complaint that again names Assistant State's Attorneys, judges, and Assistant Public Defenders as defendants. For the reasons stated in the April 30, 2008 order, the claims against these defendants are dismissed and these defendants are terminated from the case. The case may proceed as directed in the Court's April 30, 2008 order. The amended complaint submitted by plaintiff does not comply with that order, and is therefore stricken. Plaintiff is directed to comply with that order.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

ick

2008 JUL 14 PM 7:01

FILED-001